

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to lack of antecedent for the term “bp”.

Claims 1, 5-7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Komiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 5,621,618).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komiyama in view of Fischer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,168,881).

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komiyama in view of Song et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,476,642).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komiyama.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application, with Claims 11-26 being new, and Claims 1, 9-12 and 19-20 being independent claims.

Claims 1 and 3-10 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the above claim amendments are believed to overcome the rejection.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner states that Komiyama anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a device for locking an electrical device with a battery pack by thrusting the battery pack into the electrical device toward a final locking, the device comprising a locking bar (38; 40; 42); and a front recess (24) and a rear recess (26), wherein the locking bar and the two recesses are configured in one of a first set, a second set, and a third set, in the first set the locking bar (38) engaging successively the front recess (24) and the rear recess (26) during the thrusting, in the second set the locking bar (40) engaging only the front recess (24) during the thrusting, in the third set the locking bar (42) engaging only the rear recess (26) during the thrusting.

Komiyama discloses a device for locking an electrical device 10 with a battery pack 20 by thrusting the battery pack 20 into the electrical device 10 toward a final locking (FIGs. 2C and 2A), the device comprising a locking bar 13 (FIG. 2C); and a front recess 23 and a rear recess 22 (FIG. 2C), wherein the locking bar 13 and the two recesses 22, 23 are configured in a first set, in the first set the locking bar 13 engaging successively the front recess 23 and the rear recess 22 during the thrusting. Komiyama unmistakably teaches that during the thrusting of the battery pack 20 into the electrical device 10 (FIG. 2C) toward a final locking (FIG. 2A), the locking bar 13 must engage individually and successively both recesses 23 and 22, but is unable to engage either only one of the recesses 22, 23 during the thrusting. Komiyama hints nowhere

configurations for the locking bar 13 and the recesses 22, 23 according to the second set or the third set claimed in Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Komiyama.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 9 with respect to Komiyama.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 10 with respect to Komiyama.

Regarding new independent Claim 11, no known art anticipates the claim or renders the claim obvious.

Regarding new independent Claim 12, no known art anticipates the claim or renders the claim obvious.

Regarding new independent Claim 19, no known art anticipates the claim or renders the claim obvious.

Regarding new independent Claim 20, no known art anticipates the claim or renders the claim obvious.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1-26, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233